



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,986	12/03/2003	David I. Suda	D0932-00383	5088
8933	7590	10/19/2005	EXAMINER	
DUANE MORRIS, LLP IP DEPARTMENT 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196			GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/726,986

Applicant(s)

SUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen Gravini

Art Unit

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2005.  
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,8,10-16 and 20-31 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,8,10-16 and 20-31 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants have introduced the claimed term nip zone which is not found in the original filed application.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claimed nip zone is considered indefinite because it lacks a description from the claims and the specification.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1, 3-4, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by over Haddox (US 2,830,648). Haddox is considered to disclose a curing

Art Unit: 3749

oven tower **40** for heating an uncured or partially cured insulation mat (wherein the “for heating” recitation is considered a statement of intended use) said curing oven tower comprising a plurality of vertical oven zones **39, 31** comprising heat sources, and a conveyor system **26** comprising a plurality of pairs of counter rotating conveyors **58, 41, 37, 27** disposed to move said mat through said plurality of vertical oven zones for curing, said mat being disposed between said counter rotating conveyor; or alternatively:

a curing oven tower **40** for heating an uncured or partially cured fiberglass insulation mat (wherein the “for heating” recitation is considered a statement of intended use), said curing oven tower comprising a heat source and a conveyor system comprising cooperable pairs of counter-rotating conveyors **58, 41, 37, 27** arranged for moving said insulation mat both vertically and horizontally through said curing oven tower in a serpentine path wherein figures 1, 2, 4 show the horizontal and vertical serpentine conveying motion claimed since the disclosed insulation mat is moved in two planar directions. Figure 4 of Haddox is considered to show the claimed vertical path overlapping itself.

Claims 8, 10-15, and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brelsford et al. (US 2,467,291). Brelsford is considered to disclose moving an uncured or partially cured insulation through a curing oven tower at column 7 line 43 through column 10 line 52, said oven curing tower comprising a plurality of vertical oven zones **112, 113** comprising heat sources, said moving step including the step of moving the insulation mat through the plurality of vertical oven zones **81, 82, 83** for curing; or alternatively;

Art Unit: 3749

moving an uncured or partially cured insulation through a curing oven tower both horizontally and vertically in a serpentine path through a curing oven tower comprising a heat source at column 7 line 43 through column 10 line 52, and as shown in figures 1 and 2. Brelsford is also considered to disclose the claimed path vertically overlaps itself, the moving step includes the step of conveying said insulation mat with a plurality of conveyors disposed to move the insulation mat both horizontally and vertically through the oven tower, a plurality of pairs of counter rotating conveyors that cooperate to move the mat through the oven tower, and top to bottom recirculating air in figures 1 and 2.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddox in view of Fleissner (US 3,413,731). Haddox is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed top to bottom recirculating means. Fleissner, another mat curing system, is considered to disclose a top to bottom recirculating means at column 3 line 47 through column 4 line 79. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Haddox with the top to bottom recirculating means, considered disclosed in Fleissner, for the purpose of using a fluid to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddox in view of Patel et al. (US 6,357,504). Haddox is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed nip zone. Patel, another mat curing system, is considered to disclose a nip zone at column 12 lines 22-65. It would have

Art Unit: 3749

been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Haddox with the nip zone, considered disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brelsford in view of Patel et al. (US 6,357,504). Brelsford is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed nip zone. Patel, another mat curing system, is considered to disclose a nip zone at column 12 lines 22-65. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Brelsford with the nip zone, considered disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3,4,7,8,10-16 and 20-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571 272 4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMG  
October 12, 2005

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Stephen Levine".